UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,514	06/09/2005	Tsuyoshi Naganuma	Q88061	1878
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 01/22/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			WEBB, WALTER E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/538,514	NAGANUMA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	WALTER E. WEBB	1612					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 De</u>	ecember 2008						
	action is non-final.						
<i>,</i> —	, <del></del>						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
ologica in absordance with the practice ander E	x parte gadyle, 1000 O.B. 11, 40	0.0.210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,8,9,11,12 and 27</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 27</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
	·						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P	ite					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) L Other:							

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicants' arguments, filed 12/1/2008, have been fully considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitazawa et al., (previous) in view of Ishihara et al., (previous) and in further view of Salpekar et al., and Shah.

Applicant argues that the instant composition is obvious over Salpekar and Shah. A 132 declaration from Tsuyoshi Naganuma was filed attesting to a comparative test allegedly based on the teachings of Shah. Applicant's data supports the limitation of claim 1 where 85% dissolution time is not more than 60 minutes in a dissolution test. However, these results are not unexpected since Salpekar teach the use of pregelatinized starch for imparting a short dissolution time, i.e. about 20 minutes or less for 80% or more of active the active compound to dissolve. The artisan would reasonably expect the claimed dissolution rate based on the teachings of Salpekar.

In the comparative example is also improper. The data shows a much higher dissolution rate for Examples 1 and 2 compared with the other compositions, but applicant used 22 and 45 times more KMD-3213 in the other compositions. So, of

course, the dissolution rates are going to be much lower. Applicant states that the reason for this vast increase in KMD-3213 for the other composition is because Shah uses a high dosage of acetaminophen. However, the high dosage of acetaminophen was for purposes of treatment not dissolution rate. The artisan would have understood that drugs vary in dosage, and would, therefore, formulate a tablet with the proper dosage of drug incorporated therein. Nevertheless, the rejection is over Kitazawa et al., Ishihara et al. as well, and how it would have been obvious to use partially pregelatinized starch in the composition of Kitazawa, which teaches a solid dosage form of KMD-3213. Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive.

## Conclusion

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter E. Webb whose telephone number is (571) 270-3287. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:00pm Mon-Fri EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick F. Krass can be reached (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Walter E. Webb/ /Walter E Webb/ Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Frederick Krass/

Application/Control Number: 10/538,514

Page 5

Art Unit: 1612

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612